

# Summary and Proposed Disposition of comments and on SC37N1226

Date: Sept. 14, 2005

Document: M1/05-0503

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
RCM	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>1</sup>	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Proposed Editors Disposition
	5.2.7	Bullets	G	The biometric reference architecture does not address the collection of metrics associated with the capture and usage of biometric data.	Add a bullet – “collect metrics associated with the capture and usage of biometric data”	Reject – This section falls within the harmonized Part 1 section (SD11) and as per resolution in RSA, cannot be modified. Suggest submitting comments to SD11 maintenance Editor.
	5.3.1	Bullets	G	The collection of enrolment metrics should be identified as part of a typical enrolment.	Add a bullet – “collection and storage of enrolment metrics to enable system performance evaluations. Types of enrolment metrics collected may include length time to acquire the biometric data, biometric sample quality, number of attempts for successful acquisition, failure to enrol rates.	Reject – This section falls within the harmonized Part 1 section (SD11) and as per resolution in RSA, cannot be modified. Suggest submitting comments to SD11 maintenance Editor.
	5.3.2	Bullets	G	The collection of verification metrics should be identified as part of a typical verification process	Add a bullet – “metrics collection to evaluate the verification process. Types of verification metrics may include time to verify biometric data, verification score, attempts required to obtain a successful verification, verification sample quality and verification result.	Reject – This section falls within the harmonized Part 1 section (SD11) and as per resolution in RSA, cannot be modified. Suggest submitting comments to SD11 maintenance Editor.
	5.3.3	First paragraph	G	The identification section should discuss the effort to reduce the candidate list to 1 by providing a second sample of the same biometric type (second finger, second iris). If a token or identifier is read by the system during the identification process, the system can determine if it exists in the candidate list. If no token is issued to the end-user the system has no way of knowing that the end-user identifier is in the candidate list.	Add a sentence – “If a candidate list of more than one end user is generated, a system may request a second sample of the same biometric type. The second sample can be compared against the stored secondary biometric data for the end-users in the candidate list to minimize the result set.”	Reject – This section falls within the harmonized Part 1 section (SD11) and as per resolution in RSA, cannot be modified. Suggest submitting comments to SD11 maintenance Editor.

<sup>1</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Summary and Proposed Disposition of comments and on SC37N1226

Date: Sept. 14, 2005

Document: M1/05-0503

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
RCM	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of comment <sup>1</sup>	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Proposed Editors Disposition
	5.3.3	Bullets	G	The collection of identification metrics should be identified as part of a typical verification process	Add a bullet – “metrics collection to evaluate the identification process. Types of identification metrics may include time to identify end-user, attempts required to identify end-user, identification sample quality and identification result	Reject – This section falls within the harmonized Part 1 section (SD11) and as per resolution in RSA, cannot be modified. Suggest submitting comments to SD11 maintenance Editor.
	6.4	Paragraph 4	G	The example presented should state that this applies for a verification scenario only and not for identification.	The example presented should state that this applies for a verification scenario only and not for identification.	Discuss – Editor would suggest that this is self explanatory since a definition for both Verification and Identification is provided. Since both examples use the issuance of a Unique ID of some sort, this is clearly a verification scenario.
	6.4	Bullet 2	E	Clause reference is wrong	Change clause reference to 5.3.2	Accept.

<sup>1</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.

# Summary and Proposed Disposition of comments and on SC37N1226

Date: Sept. 14, 2005	Document: M1/05-0503
----------------------	----------------------

1	2	(3)	4	5	(6)	(7)
RCM	Clause No./ Subclause No./ Annex (e.g. 3.1)	Paragraph/ Figure/Table/ Note (e.g. Table 1)	Type of com- ment <sup>1</sup>	Comment (justification for change)	Proposed change	Proposed Editors Disposition

<sup>1</sup> **Type of comment:** **ge** = general    **te** = technical    **ed** = editorial – For technical comments, please indicate whether your comment is a MAJOR or MINOR technical comment.

**NOTE** Columns 1, 2, 4, 5 are compulsory.